

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
OPERATIONS RESEARCH OFFICE
6410 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND

OPERATING UNDER CONTRACT
WITH THE
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

12 December 1952

TELEPHONE
OLIVER 4200

STATINTL

Dear [REDACTED]

STATINTL

Here is that article you mentioned from the New Yorker, which I found most interesting and informative. I have listed below a few items which seemed to me to need further discussion:

Patrol Cameras

Fred Whipple at Harvard has had considerable experience in developing and using small, equatorially mounted cameras. These are exposed for several hours through a rotating sector, and show a meteor trail as a series of dashes on a background of stars, thus providing the meteor's angular velocity. In many cases two such cameras are used, separated by several miles, so that the space track of the meteor can be derived.

As I recall, meteor patrol cameras have been used in the vicinity of Boston and southern New Mexico only. All the photographs are preserved, and I am sure there have been no unidentified objects of any type to date. A possible modification of this technique which would provide more complete coverage is to use the Greenstein-Henyey wide-angle camera, which photographs 160° of the sky at once. Such a camera is in use at the Yerkes Observatory and is reported most recently in a paper by Sharpless and Osterbrook in the Astrophysical Journal, 1951. The major difficulty of operation would be changing the film, which might be made automatic.

Another use of cameras could be on selected ground radar scopes. Possibly such a camera should be kept in stand-by status and triggered by the operator when unidentified objects are on the screen.

The issue of light, hand-held cameras to aircraft pilots is another fair possibility noted in the New Yorker article.

Study of Communications Systems

One of our ORO projects is undertaking such a study, and has collected a large amount of literature. The British Army Operational Research Group has made several studies of air raid reporting systems as used in exercises, which show the distortion and "noise" introduced in any reporting system. There is a possibility of obtaining comparable

32

12 December 1952

STATINTL

data on false alarms to fire departments and "flaps" in several military situations (such as North Africa in 1942). I have been intrigued with the electronic analogue of a communications system with feedback. The circumstances leading to instability of such a system might be measured if a simple theory can be postulated; e.g., if something analogous to impedance of the circuit determines instability.

Mass Psychology

It is clear that a simple statement has not and will not convince the public. A psychologist may have some theoretical framework in which past "flaps" of this kind can be analyzed and the results extended to the present difficulty.

General Requirement

It seems to me that the major difficulty as present is the lack of a well-defined attitude among responsible officials: either there is or there is not convincing evidence of significant phenomena. To resolve this question it must be decided in advance what level of completeness is necessary in explaining reports, and what indications of hostile intent are necessary to make reported objects of importance. It might help to point out the difference between open-mindedness and indecision, and to suggest some level of credulity below which reports will not even be considered.

Dr. Aden B. Meinel who is an assistant professor of astrophysics at the Yerkes Observatory, who has been concerned with the photography of aurora and who has designed complex wide-angle cameras for the Air Force under a subcontract with Boston University, might be helpful in discussion of cameras noted above and of auroral phenomena. However, the Air Force authorities here have no record of his clearance. If you are interested in him, we could ask him by telephone what his clearance is and with what organization.

Yours sincerely,

Thornton

Thornton Page

UNCLASSIFIED

RESTRICTED

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

(SENDER WILL CIRCLE CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM)

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO		INITIALS	DATE
1	DD/I	<i>AS</i>	<i>Oct 14</i>
2	AD/IC		
3			
4			
5			
FROM		INITIALS	DATE
1	AD/IC	JQR	Oct. 13
2			
3			

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL | <input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION | <input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACTION | <input type="checkbox"/> DIRECT REPLY | <input type="checkbox"/> RETURN |
| <input type="checkbox"/> COMMENT | <input type="checkbox"/> PREPARATION OF REPLY | <input type="checkbox"/> DISPATCH |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENCE | <input type="checkbox"/> RECOMMENDATION | <input type="checkbox"/> FILE |

REMARKS: I regret I did not get very far in coordinating my paper with O/SI. Their thinking seems limited to the fact that DCI told them to do as they have done.

*Returned - to be brought to meeting
per our talk*

CB

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

RESTRICTED

UNCLASSIFIED

(SENDER WILL CIRCLE CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM)

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO		INITIALS	DATE
1	[REDACTED]	CSL	
2			
3			
4	25X1A		
5			
FROM		INITIALS	DATE
1	OIC - James G. Reher		20 Oct 52
2			
3			

<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE
<input type="checkbox"/> ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/> DIRECT REPLY	<input type="checkbox"/> RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/> COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> PREPARATION OF REPLY	<input type="checkbox"/> DISPATCH
<input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/> RECOMMENDATION	<input type="checkbox"/> FILE

REMARKS:

Security Information

9 December 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Unidentified Flying Objects

1. At 1015 hours today I talked by telephone with Captain Edward J. Ruppelt (Chief, Aerial Phenomena Branch, Analysis Division, ATIC). The purpose of the call was to determine if Captain Ruppelt would be in Washington during the next few days so that he might meet with [REDACTED] Also, if there had been any developments in the Limestone-Presque Isle case. 25X1A *11C*

25X1A 2. Captain Ruppelt stated that he had put in a request to come to Washington last week but that he had been "running into a snag" in getting away and he intimated that his intention to specifically visit CIA may have been the difficulty. By oblique references it was determined that Colonel Donald L. Bower (Chief, Analysis Division) was blocking his trip. Note: If this is true, it is difficult to understand since Colonel Bower, in discussions with [REDACTED] and myself on 25 November, indicated complete willingness for cooperation. Ruppelt stated that he would try again and hoped to be in Washington next week. I gave no indication of the agreements reached on this subject in the IAC meeting on 4 December.

3. Regarding the Limestone-Presque Isle case, Captain Ruppelt reported that the observation is suspected of being the planet Saturn. A sighting of Saturn with the same theodolite will be made within the next few days. An examination of this data with possible theodolite reading errors should indicate whether the sighting could conceivably have been of this planet. I find it difficult to believe that the moons of Saturn could be seen visibly.

4. Captain Ruppelt stated that he had a package of analyses and reports which he desired to have O/SI study and was planning to hand-carry to Washington. I mentioned that someone from O/SI might be making a trip to ATIC within the next week or so. Ruppelt stated that he would be pleased to

SECRET

Security Information

~~Security Information~~

hear from me at any time. His office telephone number is Dayton, Ohio, Kenmore 7111, Extension 65365 and his home telephone number is Walnut 7113.

25X1A

25X1A

OSI/  bm

Distribution:

- Orig - Subject file ✓ *7 days ago*
- 1 - Daily reading file *+ file in notebook*
- 1 - Chrono file

~~SECRET~~

~~Security Information~~

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/04/02 : CIA-RDP81R00560R000100020005-5

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : DAD/SI

DATE: 9 December 1952

FROM :

25X1A

SUBJECT: FCC Monitoring and Flying Saucers.

1. In accordance with your request, I interviewed Mr. Irving Weston of the Field Engineering and Monitoring Division of the FCC to determine whether the Commission at present has any knowledge of unexplained radio signals which might possibly be connected with unidentified flying saucers. His answer was no.

2. Unless such signals were reasonably persistent or were causing interference to established services, it is unlikely that they would be intercepted, or if intercepted, the subject of inquiry. This is because the stations are, in general, involved in special assignments and have a minimum of time for general cruising of the spectrum.

3. The Commission has operating 12 full time monitoring stations and 6 part time monitoring stations. Two (2) of the stations are in Alaska and one (1) in Hawaii. Because of the short range of frequencies above 30 mc/s., monitoring between 30 and about 200 mc/s. is confined pretty much to transmitters in the immediate vicinity. Most of the monitoring stations have equipment for higher frequencies, including the AN/APR-4 receiver, but make little use thereof. VHF monitoring is done to some extent by traveling inspectors with automobile receivers. It seemed likely using the example of the concerted effort to identify the first diathermy signals back in 1935 and the more recent efforts which preceded the explanation of the VHF "bursts", that any persistent occurrences of radio signals that might come from flying saucers, if below 30 mc/s., would soon be the object of considerable interest at the FCC and elsewhere.

4. The FCC maintains a file in the Briggs Building of all reported intercepts of all its monitoring stations by frequency and by call letters extending back three or four years. This file is particularly valuable in the recognition of new signals which may be reported. Information tabulated includes frequency, call letters, type of emission, service, monitoring station reporting, and an intercept supporting the identification.

5. Classification of the discussion was considered Secret.

25X1A

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/04/02 : CIA-RDP81R00560R000100020005-5

30

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

DEC 10 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Director of Central Intelligence
THROUGH: Deputy Director (Intelligence)
SUBJECT: Unidentified Flying Objects
REFERENCE: Request of the Director of 10 December 1952

1. The following is a summary of the current situation with respect to the investigation of unidentified flying objects. Recent incidents include:

a. Movies of ten (10) unidentified flying objects (unexplained on the basis of natural phenomena or known types of aircraft), near Tremonton, Utah, on 2 July 1952.

b. A very brilliant unidentified light over the coast of Maine for about four hours on the night of 10-11 October at a height computed to be two or three times that which can be sustained by any known device.

c. Alleged contact with a device on the ground in Florida late this summer which left some presently unexplained after-effects.

d. Numerous other sightings of lights or objects which either in configuration or performance do not resemble any known aerial vehicle or explainable natural phenomena.

25X1A

2. In furtherance of the IAC action on 4 December, O/SI has been working with [redacted] consultant (former Director of Research, WSEG), toward establishing a panel of top scientists and engineers in the fields of astrophysics, nuclear energy, electronics, etc., to review this situation. Wholehearted cooperation has been assured by DI/USAF and ATIC, and a visit by AD/SI, [redacted] of SI to ATIC is planned for Friday. It is hoped to organize the panel and undertake substantive scientific review of this subject within the next two to three weeks.

25X1A

H. MARSHALL CHADWELL
Assistant Director
Scientific Intelligence

Distribution:

DD/I - 1
Opns/SI - 1
Prod/SI - 1
AD/SI - 2

32